REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Claims 1-18 remain pending. Claims 1, 2, 3, 7, and 13 are independent.

INTERVIEW CONDUCTED

Applicants appreciate the Examiner for conducting an interview with Applicants' representative on November 29, 2005.

§ 112, 1ST PARAGRAPH REJECTION

All pending claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. *See Final Office Action, page 2, item 2.* Applicants respectfully traverse.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner alleges that the claimed subject matter "only a portion" is not enabling. However, specification clearly states, "This kind of screen **conversion can be performed for only one part of the screen around the point at which the line-of-sight is detected**, or can involve alteration of the tones of the entire screen." *See specification, page 8, line 27 – page 9, line 2.* The conversion refers to automatically changing the dynamic range of the selected part of the display.

Thus, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's allegation. However, to promote the prosecution of the application, claims have been amended to read "at least a part ... wherein the at least a part is less than a whole. Examiner agreed that there is support for such recitation.

Therefore, the Section 112, 1st paragraph rejection no longer applies. Applicants respectfully that the Section 112, 1st paragraph rejection of claims 1-18 be withdrawn.

§ 103 REJECTION – IKEDA

Claims 1, 7-8 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ikeda et al. (U.S. Patent 6,204,881). *See Final Office Action, page 3, item 3.* Applicants respectfully traverse.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner merely maintains the rejection of these claims as stated in the Non-Final Office Action dated April 20, 2005 (previous Office Action). In short, the Examiner did not even attempt to address the amendments to the claims as submitted in the Rule 111 Reply dated July 20, 2005 (previous Reply). Applicants fully demonstrated in the previous Reply that Ikeda cannot teach or suggest the feature of the rejected claims. Applicants maintain all arguments made.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 7-8 and 10 based on Ikeda be withdrawn.

§ 103 REJECTION – IKEDA, MOLLOY

Claims 9 and 11-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ikeda in view of Molloy (U.S. Patent 6,078,349). *See Final Office Action, page 4, item 4.* Applicants respectfully traverse.

Again, the Examiner simply maintains the rejection he makes in the previous Office Action and failed to address the claims as amended in the previous Reply. Applicants maintain all arguments made.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 9 and 11-12 based on Ikeda and Molloy be withdrawn.

§ 103 REJECTION – UEDA

Claims 2, 3-4, 6, 13, 14 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ueda et al. (U.S. Patent 5,953,459). *See Final Office Action, page 4, item 5.* Applicants respectfully traverse.

Like the situations described above, the Examiner merely maintains the previous rejections and does not address the amendments made in the previous Reply. Applicants maintain all arguments made.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2, 3-4, 6, 13, 14 and 16 based on Ueda be withdrawn.

§ 103 REJECTION – UEDA, MOLLOY

Claims 5, 15, and 17-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ueda in view of Molloy. *See Final Office Action, page 4, item 6.* Applicants respectfully traverse.

Like the situations described above, the Examiner merely maintains the previous rejections and does not address the amendments made in the previous Reply. Applicants maintain all arguments made.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 5, 15 and 17-18 based on Ueda and Molloy be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

All objections and rejections raised in the Final Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Hyung Sohn (Reg. No. 44,346), to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH &, BIRCH, LLP

By: _____

Marc S. Weiner
Reg. No. 32,181
HNS

MSW/HNS/ags
0879-0289P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000